ACTION ITEM: Revisions to the “Policy on Post-Tenure Review” of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The proposed revisions to the “Policy on Post-Tenure Review” have been initiated by the Faculty Senate to simplify the post-tenure review process. The Faculty Senate approved these revisions on November 30, 2005, and Chancellor Sullivan approved the changes on December 15, 2005. The most significant proposed revision to UNCG’s post-tenure review policy limits the basic categories for evaluating performance in a cumulative review to satisfactory and unsatisfactory. In the current UNCG policy there is no limit to the number of categories which may be assigned in a cumulative review. Another significant change is the removal of cumulative reviews from Section III, Rewards, which encourages recognition and reward for exemplary performance in both annual and cumulative reviews. Cumulative reviews were removed from this section because no resources have been allocated by the Board of Governors or the State since this policy was approved for providing rewards for an exemplary cumulative review, but faculty members continue to be rewarded for exemplary annual reviews. Another change provides that faculty members who come up for promotion reviews and cumulative reviews in the same year shall have their promotion reviews count as their cumulative reviews. As proposed, positive promotion reviews shall count as satisfactory cumulative reviews.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

That the Board of Trustees of The University of North Carolina at Greensboro amend the “Policy on Post-Tenure Review” as described in the summary above and as indicated in the attached draft of the revised policy.

A. Edward Uprichard
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Attachment

POLICY ON POST-TENURE REVIEW
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

(Approved by the Faculty Senate, September 2, 1998, November 30, 2005)
(Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 4, 1998)
(Approved by the Board of Governors, September 11, 1998)
INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Welfare and Professional Development Committee has been given the task of developing the criteria for Post-Tenure Review (PTR). The purpose of this report is to provide a framework for developing the criteria to be used for evaluating performance of tenured faculty as part of the PTR process for faculty growth and development. The report is based on the guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors in the report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review (Administrative Memorandum #371) and was written after a review of similar documents from other universities in the UNC system. The PTR process is designed to enhance individual efforts and to relate these efforts to the goals of academic units and the University through annual and cumulative reviews.

DEFINITION AND PURPOSE

The definition of PTR according to the Administrative Memorandum is: “a comprehensive, formal periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality.”

The purpose of PTR is to:

1. Sustain and facilitate excellence among tenured faculty by recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding faculty performance.

2. Foster faculty development in the areas of teaching, research, service, and directed professional activity by evaluating all aspects of professional performance and by acknowledging progress in specific areas and identifying specific activities which can be undertaken if improvement is needed.

POLICY

Post-Tenure Review is required of all tenured faculty. Building on annual reviews, PTR is a cumulative evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. An additional category, directed professional activity, may be used by a unit as a fourth category of evaluation if appropriate (see UNCG Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure). The cumulative review shall take place no less frequently than every five years and must provide for the evaluation of all aspects of faculty performance during this period relative to the mission of the unit and institution. Reviews of faculty within a unit (department within the College of Arts and Sciences or Professional Schools, or entire School or Library in cases of no division into departments) will be the responsibility of the unit head, although the review must involve peers. Yearly and cumulative reviews of unit heads will be conducted by the deans (or provost, in cases in which the dean serves as the unit head) and evaluations of the deans by the provost. The PTR policy respects the basic principles of academic freedom and must not abrogate, in any way, the criteria and procedures for due process and for dismissal or other disciplinary action established in accordance with the UNCG Handbook for Faculty and Chapter VI of The Code of the University.

THE POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCESS

Starting in the 1998-1999 academic year, each unit must institute a written annual review process if it does not currently have one and conduct cumulative reviews of some faculty. Cumulative reviews and annual reviews take place at the unit level.

I. Annual Reviews. Written annual reviews should reflect how faculty promote the goals of their unit and the mission of the University. The responsibility for developing criteria and procedures for evaluation of tenured faculty performance rests with each academic unit. The criteria must consider individual faculty profiles and special contributions as well as the faculty member’s accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Directed professional activity may also serve as a category of evaluation. The annual review process should include:
A. **The UNCG Report Form.** The UNCG Report Form for University faculty must be used, but individual units are free to modify the form to fit their specific needs. Each unit must establish its own criteria for performance. Faculty members must complete the UNCG Report Form, including a written summary of objectives and accomplishments, and may include supporting materials. In cases of disagreement between the unit head and faculty member on objectives and accomplishments, the head shall provide a faculty member with a written statement of the head’s specific reasons for disagreeing with any or all of the objectives and accomplishments.

B. **Significant peer review.** Significant peer review is defined as involving a committee composed of three or more tenured faculty members, but the unit head shall not be a member of the committee. The committee is charged with conducting a cumulative review (see II. below). However, if a faculty member requests significant peer review for his or her annual review evaluation, then this request shall be granted. The composition of the committee should be determined at the unit level. The unit head (and the review committee, when applicable) must evaluate the annual report and decide into which category each faculty member is to be placed (i.e., exemplary, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory) base upon the faculty member’s overall performance in the areas of teaching, research, service, and directed professional activity (when applicable). Within the context of the annual review, the category of satisfactory may, but need not, be divided into additional evaluative sub-categories, e.g., fair, good, and very good. If the review committee’s decision is not unanimous, any dissenting member of the review committee may include a letter of dissent, to be made available to the faculty member and kept in his or her file. The evaluation process should take into account the objectives that each faculty member establishes at the beginning of the current year and any dissenting letters or faculty response letters from prior years in the current five-year cycle. Faculty members may add further documentation in support of their teaching, research, service, or directed professional activity if they so wish.

C. **The end of year report.** The end of year report will state whether the faculty member’s overall performance for the year is exemplary, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory and will include a written summary of the year’s achievements from the unit head and the peer review committee (when applicable) with recommendations for rewards or improvement as appropriate. Disagreements between the unit head and the peer review committee will be resolved by the dean or provost (in cases in which the dean serves as unit head).

II. **Cumulative Review.** The cumulative review prepared by the unit head, dean, or provost summarizes the annual reports of a faculty member’s progression of work and occurs at least once every five years. The cumulative review, which incorporates the annual review for the year in which the cumulative review takes place, should include a summary evaluation of all aspects of the professional performance of a faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, service, and directed professional activity (when applicable). The cumulative review will categorize a faculty member’s overall professional performance as being either satisfactory or unsatisfactory. For the purposes of the cumulative review, the category of satisfactory will not be subdivided into further evaluative sub-categories. Significant peer review is a necessary part of the cumulative review process. It involves a review committee of three or more tenured faculty charged with conducting a cumulative review, but the unit head is not a member of the committee. Disagreements between the unit head and the peer review committee on the content of the cumulative review report will be resolved by the dean or provost (in cases in which the dean serves as unit head). An unsatisfactory cumulative review can only occur if there have been at least two unsatisfactory annual reviews in the current PTR cycle.

If, in a given academic year, a tenured faculty member scheduled for cumulative review is recommended for promotion through the first and second levels of promotion review, then that faculty member will be deemed to have had a satisfactory cumulative review;¹ there is no need to

¹ Note that the two levels of promotion review in question may not be the same in a non-departmentalized unit as in a departmentalized unit.
do a separate cumulative review in addition to the promotion-review. Otherwise, the faculty member in question will undergo a [separate] cumulative review. However, any tenured faculty member who is promoted in the same academic year as his or her cumulative review will be deemed to have had a satisfactory cumulative review.

III. **Rewards.** Annual reviews should recognize, encourage, and reward exemplary performance by means of special recognition such as:

1. Nomination for awards
2. Merit increases
3. Research leaves
4. Revisions of work load

IV. **Unsatisfactory cumulative review.** In cases of an unsatisfactory cumulative review, the following procedures must be implemented:

A. The unit head, dean, or provost shall complete and sign a form declaring that the faculty member has an unsatisfactory cumulative review. This form documents the specific reasons why the faculty member has been given an unsatisfactory cumulative review. Each of the relevant areas of performance must be addressed. A copy of this form shall be forwarded to the faculty member, dean, and peer evaluators. The unit head must, in consultation with the dean or provost, peer evaluators, and the individual faculty member, draft a plan with specific steps, specified resources as appropriate, and a time line for reasonable improvement, allowing a maximum of three years.

B. The plan must include a written statement of the consequences should improvement not occur within the designated time line.

C. A copy of this document is provided to the faculty member and another copy placed in the faculty member’s file.

D. If a faculty member fails to meet the expected levels of improvement in performance stated in the plan, then the unit head may sign a formal document declaring the faculty member to be professionally deficient and recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action, as established in Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University. The only admissible grounds for such a recommendation by the unit head in this context are incompetence or neglect of duty, as consistent with Chapter VI of *The Code* of the University and UNCG *Handbook for Faculty*.

E. The College, the Schools, and the Library shall each create a College, School, or Library committee of tenured faculty members called the Committee on Post-Tenure Review whose charge is to review and approve plans for improvement of faculty who receive unsatisfactory cumulative reviews. Such a review will occur if and only if a faculty member appeals the initial plan. Both the faculty member and unit head may provide additional documentary evidence to the committee. Disagreements between the unit head and the Committee on Post-Tenure Review will be resolved by the dean or provost (in cases in which the dean serves as unit head).

F. If the unit head recommends to the Chancellor that the faculty member be discharged or subjected to other disciplinary action as established in Section 7 of the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Due Process, and Tenure*, then the following process of review shall be initiated. First, the unit head’s recommendation shall be reviewed by the tenured faculty in that unit as specified in Section 3.G of the *Regulations on Academic Freedom, Due Process, and Tenure*. Such a recommendation shall be further reviewed in the following order: College, School, or Library Committee on Promotions and Tenure; Dean; University Committee on Promotions and Tenure; Provost; and Chancellor. Both the faculty member and unit head may provide additional documentary evidence to the reviewing entities. The recommendations at each
level of review shall be forwarded, together with all of the documentary evidence and all of the prior recommendations, to the next level of review.

Timetable

PTR is to be first implemented in the 1998-1999 academic year. This time frame will require that all faculty undergo annual review by the end of that academic year and that some faculty undergo cumulative review. Each unit will provide to the provost a list of faculty members to be reviewed. To avoid reviewing all tenured faculty at once, in the initial cumulative review year and every five years thereafter, units may decide to conduct cumulative reviews on the anniversary of the faculty member's most recent tenure/promotion review that is divisible by five, or units may review first those tenured faculty members with the longest accrued time since the last formal evaluation for tenure or promotion. Large units should review approximately 20 percent of eligible faculty every year. This process would eliminate any undue burden on units by staggering the cumulative review cycle.